Motion to suspend Rule 322 for moving a Resolution under Rule 133.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Madam Deputy Speaker, yesterday I tried to get the consent of the Hon'ble Speaker for suspension of Rule 322 and to permit me to move the Resolution under Rule 133. Number of Points of Orders were raised and also answered, So far as the suspension of the rule is concerned......

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—I raise to a Point of Order, What is the subject under which the Leader of the Opposition is raising this issue ? We have got the List of Business on hand. The subject should be there on the Agenda. Even to seek the suspension of rule, whether such a subject is there on the Agenda, I want to know. This is a legal issue and under the rules, the Leader of the Opposition cannot raise it unless it is included in the List of Business for the day, and if it is not there such a subject cannot be taken up. I seek the Ruling of the Chair.

SRI GOVIND P. WADEYARAJ.—I do not know whether the hon'ble member Sri Nanaiah was present yesterday. He should know that the Leader of the House has said that we can take up this motion today to request the Speaker to give consent. Yesterday discussion took place as to whether the Leader of the Opposition should be allowed to request the Chair to permit him to argue for requesting the consent of the Chair so far as suspension of Rule 322 is concerned. Once again I would like to bring to the notice of my hon'ble friends Sriyuths Nanaiah and Bhasker Shetty that the Hon'ble Chief Minister agreed yesterday permitting the Opposition Leader to make his submission today.

(Some hon'ble members from the Treasury Bench said : 'No')

SRI GOVIND P. WADEYARAJ.—If the hon'ble members were to say 'No', I only pity their ignorance.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—Yesterday this matter came up for discussion and what the Speaker said was, the matter be decided as to at what time it should come, whethere it should be included in the List of Business, whether the Speaker is satisfied with the legality. etc. But no assurance was given that it could be taken up tody.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—Madam Deputy Speaker, yesterday perhaps your goodself was also present. It was a gentleman's agreement that the Leader of the Opposition should be allowed to make a preliminary submission today seeking the consent by the Speaker about the suspenssion of a Part of Rule 133 and as to why it should be suspended, of course without going into the substance of the Resolution.Rule 322 is the provision under which the rule can be suspended Yesterday, when

the Leader of the Opposition started explaining as to why Rule 322 should be suspended, there was lot of discussion, and the Leader of the House said : 'he had no objection to make a submission as to why the rule should be suspended'. It is on record. Now if the Ruling Party does not want to keep to their word and once again start warngling and obstructing the Leader of the Opposition to make his submission, then it means that they have no intention to keep to their words. If that is the stand they are taking, we will also take a different stand.

SRI M. V. RAJASEKHARAN.—Apart from the Leader of the House giving the assurance, even the Hon'ble Speaker was a party to it. The Speaker said 'All right, tomorrow I will permit you'. It is on record and the Hon'ble Deputy Speaker may check up. I do not know why hon'ble member on the other side get excited over the issue.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ್ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ನಿನ್ನೆ ಇದೇ ರೂಲ್ ೧೩೩ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ೩೨೨ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ರೂಲ್‌ನ್ನು ಸಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಆ ಕಡೆಗೂ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಆದಾಗ, ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ವೇಳೆ ಆದ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣವೆಂದು ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದು ಹೌದು ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗಟ್ಟಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.—ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಪ್‌ರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರು ರೆಜಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಇದನ್ನು ಇವತ್ತು ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಲು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಸಿಗದಿದ್ದಾಗ ಧರಣಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಪುನಃ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಆ ಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಬಹಳಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ...

ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋವಿಂದ ಪಿ. ಒಡೆಯರಾಜ್.—ಈ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುವವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಗೂ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER.–At this juncture I would like to make an observation. I have noticed hon'ble members start to say something and go off at a tangent and forget the very purpose as to why they were standing. When you want to place something before the House, kindly do it, but do not go off at a tangent and start some half-way discussion because it will lead you nowhere.

SRI GOVIND P. WADEYARAJ,—We want them to respect the views of their Leader !

3–00 P.M.

I request the hon'ble members on the other side to respect the sentiments of their own leader.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಮುಸಿಯಪ್ಪ,—ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸವೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ ಅವರು ಹಾಗೂ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಆರುಮುಗಂರವರು ಈ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ನಾಳೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದು ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ಸಲಹೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನೋಡೋಣ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ

ಇದು ಆಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಈವತ್ತಿನ ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಏನೆಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

† SRI C. M. ARUMUGAM.—When I raised the objection that before it finds a place in the agenda it is not possible to allow anybody to move a motion ; for that the Chief Minister also agreed and the Speaker in turn said that the Leader of the Opposition can raise this matter today. Let us accept this fact. Since it has been agreed by the Speaker ; how he is going to touch upon the matter connected with the resolution, these are matters left to the Speaker to allow or not. I have got one appeal to make. The political climate both in Delhi and in Bangalore has become hot, I would submit to our Leader of the Opposition to drop his motion as it if directed against an individual Minister. It is said by some that the move is to take vengence on personel grounds. For the last one month and fortyfive days we debated several matters on principle but not on personalities. I would therefore appeal to the Leader of the Opposition not to move the motion and thus save the peaceful atmosphere that we had all these days. The matter is not so urgent and it is not of public importance. I once again request the Leader of the Opposition not to move the resolution to suspend the rules of procedure.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಗಂಗಾಧರನ್.—ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಅಥವಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಈವತ್ತಿನದಿವಸ ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ನೀಡಬಹುದೇ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥಾ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ನಾನಯ್ಯನವರು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

(MR. SPEAKER in the Chair)

† SRI M.C. NANAIAH.–When I raised the point of order, the Leader of the Opposition started moving the motion or speaking on the motion relating to the suspension of rule 322 ofthe Rules of Procedure I raise the point of order at that time since the motion was not in the list of business for discussion today, the Leader of the Opposition cannot take up that matter for discussion.

Second things is, any motion to be moved for suspension of rule 322 in relation to any resolution or motion, such a resolution or a motion should be before the Assembly for discussion. If such a resolution or motion is before the Assembly, then the moving of the motion under rule 322 will not arise. So far I have not been able to locate any decision of the Chair of this House for having suspended

the rule ; but I am equipped with the decision of our Parliament relating to the suspension of the rule. I will read from M. N. Kaul, first Edition page 768.

> "A similar question came up whether the suspension of a rule can be done when any motion or resolution is not before the Parliament. Then the Chairman held, when such a resolution or a motion is not before the House, the suspension of the rule cannot be done".

A motion for suspension of the rule in its application to a particular motion may be moved only when that motion is before the House. Before the House is clarified as if it is included in the list of business.

A motion for the suspension of a rule can be done under rule 322. The Leader of the Opposition wants rule 133 in so far as it relates to giving notice of 15 days time, may be suspended in its application to resolution, which he has already given notice of. If that resolution which he has given notice of is not included in the list of business, if such a resolution is not before the House, then the motion to suspend rule 322 will not arise. There are three things involved which are narrated in this chapter.

1. Business before the House at the moment ;
2. Business before the House for the day included in the list of business but not before the house at the moment.
3. Business pending in the House but not before the House, *i.e.*, not included in the list of business.

As far as the resolution which has been given under rule 133, the resolution is not before the House at the moment. The resolution is not included in the list of business ; the resolution is not pending before the House also. When these things are not there, I do not know how the Leader of the Opposition can move for the suspension of rule No. 322. I think as far as the resolution which is not before House is concerned which is not at the moment before the House, which is not included in the list of business, the suspension of rule can never take place. That is the decision of the Parliament. I hope that decision is also binding on this House. There is no decision as far as suspension of rule 322 is concerned in our House. Hence I expect a ruling from the Chair whether a resolution can be moved for the suspension of the rule in relation to rule 322 when such a resolution is not before the House for discussion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವಿ. ರಾಜಶೇಖರನ್.—ತಾವು ಮತ್ತು ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಘಂಟೆಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ಈಗ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾನ್ ನಾನಯ್ಯನವರು ಏನೇನು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಹಾಗೂ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಕೋಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ. ಅವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಿನ್ನೆಯೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ತಮಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸವೇ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ಎತ್ತಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಾಯಕರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನೀವು ಕೂಡ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I had said that we can take up this matter tomorrow.

SRI M. V. RAJASEKHARAN.—So the Leader of the Opposition was permitted to raise the matter today. to the extent he is right. Now I cannot understand why there is objection when you in your judgement agreed to permit the Leader of the Opposition to raise the matter today. Even before he started speaking the hon'ble members have started opposing. I request, let the gentleman's agreement arrived at in between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition and you as the judge, be carried out. That is what I want.

† SRI VEERAPPA MOILY (Karkal).—Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the matter relating to taking up of this matter on preliminary basis. It must be either permitted under Rule or by conventions which are laid down by this House or Lok Sabha or the House of Commons. Mr. Nanaiah, the hon'ble Member has cited some of the procedures and conventions laid down in the Practice and Procedure of Parliament by Kaul. I would like to support his view and also quote the convention laid down in the very same House *i.e.* Karnataka Legislative Assembly Debates-Vol. 39, on July 28th. This is the latest convention or the re-inforcement of the rule which has been made by this House. At that time, a Motion was to be moved by the Hon'ble Chief Minister on 28th July 1975 to suspend the rule. But at that time, the Opposition Members and also the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition at that time Mr. Deve Gowda, raised objection stating that it cannot be taken up by suspending other business before the House. The Hon'ble Chief Minister pointed out that since it was put in the list of business, he might be permitted to move the same. Only then, it was permitted to be moved and then the matter was concluded. So, this was the convention which has been laid down in this House.

Of course, the Hon'ble Leader of the House was pleased to say that it might be raised. When he has given his consent, of course, we have to honour it. But at the same time, we have to look into the conventions established earlier. If it had been included in today's business, safely and smoothly we could have taken it up. We have to honour' gentleman's agreement' provided, the concerned persons are required to follow certain disciplines and norms which is called 'gentleman's agreement'.

Secondly, I would like to draw your attention to Rule 289. The rule 289 reads like this ;

> "No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of reply".

Here, the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition intends to make certain charges of incriminatory nature. I don't know whether a copy has been supplied to the concerned Minister, Of course the Speaker, must have supplied a copy of the same. If he is not given an opportunity to say, I think it is not proper even to raise that matter on the floor of the House. Unless he is given an opportunity to make an investigation into the allegation and he is given an opportunity to give reply at his own convenience, the matter cannot raised here. He must be given an opportunity to prepare and defend himself. Otherwise, the privilege of the Hon Minister Sri Srikantiah, will be deprived. I don't think this August House can deprive that privilege to the Hon'ble Minister or any other Member in this way very lightly. So, I once again submit that firstly, it cannot be raised since it is against the conventions of this House. Secondly, if it raised on the floor of the House it is contrary to the Rule 289. In view of this, I suggest that let the matter come up in a regular way. Therefore, let not our Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition violate the norms and conventions established in this House and also the privilege given to a particular Member of this House.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಿಲಿಮಿನರಿಯಾಗಿ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಕನ್‌ವಿನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.-Sir, while raising a point of order Mr. Nanaiah made certain obsevations. After that Mr. Moily also stated certain observations established in this House. But I would like to quote the latest ruling given by the Speaker in the last session with regard to the suspension of the rules. They are like this ತಾ॥ ೨೯-೩-೧೯೭೮ರಂದು ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯು ಸಾರಾಂಶ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದೆ.-

"ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಿರ್ಣಯುವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರು ನಿರ್ಣಯುವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಯುವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಕೇಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ ? ಅವರು ನಿರ್ಣಯುವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅವರು ಪೂರ್ವಭಾವಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ."

ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಆದಕಾರಣ ಇಂದೂ ಸಹ ರೂಲ್ 229ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಿಲಿಮಿನರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—There was a suggestion by hon Member Sri Armugam not to press this resolution. He also stated that because of personal vengeance this has been moved. That should not be on record. I understand his sentiment. That statement would amount to an insinuation. I would assure this House this resolution is brought with the highest object of maintaining purity in the administration. Hon. Minister Sri Srikantaiah is a very good friend of mine. But here there is a charge and it is under investigation.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಡ್ಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ?

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—That thing has gone on record; he said that the resolution is motivated with personal vengeance.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿ, ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಪಾಲಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಅನ್‌ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ನೋಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I request the Chair to expunge these observations.

MR. SPEAKER.—I will examine.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I would make it very clear there is no malefide or personal motive. Nothing defamatory is there in the resolution. Even if the rule is suspended, unless the resolution complies with all the rules of procedure it cannot be moved. Now. Sir, I am seeking the permission for suspension of the rule. Is the matter so important to make suspension necessary? I would like to refer to a debate in this House in the last Assembly when there was all egation against Hon. Minister Mr, Kittur. It related to the disappearance of a lady by name Smt. Sumitra Desai. I do not want to go into the details. The Hon. Chief Minister made a statement. He assured fair investigation by the State Police. Ultimately, the Minister was asked to resign. After the investigation was over, he was again taken back to the Cabinet. This House has raised such matters In the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. a resolution has been moved seeking permission to appoint a Commission of enquiry on the basis of correspondence between the Prime Minister and the ex-Home Minister Mr, Charan Singh. The matter has been raised only on the correspondence. I would also like to bring to the notice of this August House

that a statement was made by Home Minister Mr. Charan Singh and the Chair permitted the motion to be moved. It was opposed but ultimately the Chair permitted, The Speaker of the Lok Sabha permitted discussion. There after it was rejected. In the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha when the questions of integrity honesty and allegations of corruption against men in power are raised then, Sir, the House has been permitted to debate it The Chairman and the Speaker have permitted discussion and discussions are going on. To keep high standards in the admtnistration such discussion are necessary and definitely this is a matter of great public importance. A case has been entrusted to the C.O.D. against the Minister. Why the rule has to be suspended has to be stated now Whether it is yesterday, or to-day or tomorrow, the principle that is involved is this. There are allegations and charges against a Cabinet Minister. Whether he should continue in office, that is the principle involvod. Whether it is X, or Y, or Z I am not concerned with.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Sir, let the member not give any publicity. Let him speak on the admissibility. Let him not, in a muffled way try to get at it, Let him not put it that way. We do not want the name of the person. With due respect, we want your ruling on this.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I am not speaking about any name. But I cannot argue in a vaccum. What is the principle involved? That is what I said.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.– ಯಾವ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಅಥವಾ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ?

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I am trying to persuade you to give consent to this resolution. When there is an investigation against a Cabinet Minister by the State Police, is it admissible or is it in keeping with the cannons established of sound administration and clean administration that he should continue? The principle involved is whether the Minister should continue in power when there is investigation by the subordinate Police. There are a number of instances where people have resigned when there is investigation. The Chief Minister asked hon. Minister Kittur to resign. Now I seek suspension of this rule because a principle is involved and this is necessary in order to keep up high standards of administration in the State.

I have not heard the Hon. Chief Minister but still I would definitely hope that the Hon. Chief Minister would give suitable assurance and take suitable action so far as this.

3.30 P.M.

SRI K. BHASKER NAIDU,—This is too much. The hon. speaker may give the ruling now. Enough has been discussed in this House about the whole thing. Now he is telling what the Chief Minister is going to say. It is my right to ask the chair to give a ruling and stop this matter.

MR. SPEAKER.—Unless the words are offending any hon. Member, how can. .....

(INTERRUPTIONS)

SRI K. BHASKER NAIDU.—This requires a firm handling by the Chair

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ನನ್ನ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಇದೆ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅಫೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ. The Hon. Chief Minister will be given an opportunity. He will have his say and then only I will give my ruling. Please have patience.

SRI P. K. RANGANATHAN,—Should we not express our opinion also? The Hon, Leader of the Opposition was telling that Mr. Kittur was a Minister but because of somebody, he was not there as a Minister for some time and again he has been appointed as a Minister after an enquiry

SRI S. R. BOMMAI,—I would like to appeal through you not only to the Hon, Chief Minister but also to all the hon, Members of this House to take this Motion and the Resolution attached to it in the proper perspective. I would appeal to their good sense to keep up the high standards of administration in the State, I would also like to appeal to them with all the capacities at my command not to refuse to discuss this matter. We owe a duty to the tax-payers and the people of the State. If you refuse to discuss such a matter, we are fighting shy because whether a particular man belongs to this group or that group, we should rise above all party differences. We may belong to different parties but the principle i.e.. the State is in need of a clean administration is important and I am sure the Hon. Chief Minister is very much interested in giving us the clean administration and to set up healthy conventions. Therefore, I appeal once again that the rule be suspended and let the motion be allowed. Let us express our opinion. The matter is still under investigation. The person is not guilty. There is no charge-sheet. Unless all these things are done, he is presumed to be innocent. I made it very clear that the person who is involved is a very good friend of mine. There is nothing personal against him but at the same time, we must do our duty-whether he is my friend; whether he is my relative; whether he

is my party man or not. We should rise above all considerations in the interest of pure administration. With these observations, I appeal to yon to permit me to move this Motion and there upon the House has to give its consent. I appeal to every hon. Member to give the consent for suspending the rule.

† SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—I am also raising another legal issue. Now a question has been raised requesting the Hon. Speaker to suspend Rule No. 322 and the observation of my learned Friend the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is an important principle is involved in this. What is the important principle involved in this issue which requires a suspension of the Rule 322 for the discussion of the resolution? We don't know the contents of the Resolution but however, what I submit before the Hon. Speaker as far as this issue is concerned is, by circumventing the entire Rules of Procedure. is it necessary to discuss a resolution? We are not afraid of discussing a resolution that will be tabled by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or by the Opposition themselves if it comes in the ordinary course of things. But what we are objecting to it is the suspension of the rule by circumventing the entire Rules of Procedure and thereby obstructing the procedure of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—You have gone further.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—He is asking the consent of the Speaker to move such a thing. It cannot be done. Asfar as suspension of the rule is concerned. if the Motion is not before the Assembly, if the Resolution is not before the Assembly, such a question can never be discussed. Secondly. circumventing the normal Procedure of the House for the purose of discussing this matter is not necessary. It is not as if a particular person has become a Minister only day before yesterday. If such a thing had been taken place day before yesterday, there would have been some force in the resolution. The first sitting of the House was in March and thereafter, we sat for more than 20 days. We have finished 30-32 days sittings. And at the fag end of the Session, they want to suspend the rule. For what purpose? What is the legal importance involved in it? Rule 133 is a compact rule. Such a rule can never be questioned. Such a rule can never be put an end to. In addition to giving 15 days notice under Rule 133, we have to read Rule 28(5). Therefore, he is not only trying to seek the suspension of the rule relating to giving of 15 days notice but also to the suspension of Rule 28 relating to the regulation of the non-official business relating to resolutions etc., In that case, a vacuum will be created and therefore suspension of the rule can never be done. Since the Resolution is not before the House, the suspension of the Rule can never be done and as a preliminary issue, this should not be permitted.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ನಿನ್ನೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆವೋ, ಈಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾವು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ರೂಲ್ ೧೫೩ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ನಿಯಮಗಳು ಇದೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ೧೫ ದಿವಸ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ತಾವು ಈ ೧೫ ದಿವಸದ ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ರದ್ದು ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಇವತ್ತೇ ತಮ್ಮ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಹೀಗಿವೆ. ಈಗಲೇ ಆಗಬೇಕು, ೧೫ ದಿವಸದ ನಂತರ ಆದರೆ ಏನೂ ಕೆಟ್ಟುಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತೇ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂತ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ನಾವು ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೋ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಇದೆ. ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ನಮಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಭೂತವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳು ಶತಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಂಥ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು, ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಒಂದು ಮೌಲ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸ ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕೋಸ್ಕರ......

(೧೦–೧೨ ಜನ ಒಂದೇ ಬಾರಿಗೆ ನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.)

(ಗೊಂದಲ)

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ್‌ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಪಟೇಲರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ಕಡೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಮೀರಿಸುವಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಸರಳವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಮುಗಿಸಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಸರಳವಾದ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಒಂದು ಮನೆ ಇರುತ್ತೆ ಅಂತ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಮನೆಯ ಕಟ್ಟೆಮೇಲೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಲಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ, ಬೆಳಗಿನ ಜಾವದ ಹೊತ್ತು......

(ಗೊಂದಲ)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅಡ್ಮಿಸಬಿಲಿಟಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಲಾ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಡಿಸಿಷನ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್‌ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ. ಕಥೆಯಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಗುಂಡೂರಾವ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಯಾರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕಥೆ ಗಿತೆ ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಸಾರಾಂಶ ಇಷ್ಟೆ ನಿಯಮ ರದ್ದು ಮಾಡಿ, ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ. ಏತಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ? ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಏನು ? ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಏನು ? ಅದಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ತಾವು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಏನು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಗಾಬರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ.

(ಗೊಂದಲ)

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ವಿಪ್ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, I raise a point of order. When a Member is making his submission, unless that Member uses words which are not permitted under the rules or otherwise not permitted, he should not be disturbed.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Let the hon'ble Member make his statement. If there is any thing unparliamentary or if he refers to the resolution, we will take care of it. If the hon'ble Member has got any sallies to throw on us, I can also throw sallies on them. You need not worry. Therefore, I request the Members not to make any disturbance.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ ಆಗಿದೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಊಟ ಮಾಡು ನೀರು ಕುಡಿಬೇಡ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಡ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಇಚ್ಛೆಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಮನೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ, ಆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಲಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ......

(ಗೊಂದಲ)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮತ್ತೆ ತಾವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—೧೦೦ ಜನ ಕಳ್ಳರಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಕೆಮ್ಮಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು. ೧೦೦ ಜನ ಕಳ್ಳರು ಒಬ್ಬನನ್ನು ಕೆಮ್ಮಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ.

(ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಗೊಂದಲ ಮಾಡುವರು)

ಈ ಸದನದ ಮುಂದೆ ನಾವು ಇನ್ನೂ ಎರಡು ಬೇರೆ ಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಎತ್ತುವುದರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಮತ್ತು ರೂಲ್ ನಂ. ೫೦ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದನ್ನು ಓದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಡ್ಮಿಸಬಿಲಿಟಿ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಈಗ ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಿಡಿ ಆ ಮಾತು ಬೇರೆ. ನಾವು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿವರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question before the House is only to seek consent about admissibility of the motion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಗಂಗಾಧರನ್.—ಶ್ರೀ ನಾನಯ್ಯನವರು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ರೂಲ್ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್‌ರವರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಗಂಗಾಧರನ್.—ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಗಂಗಾಧರನ್.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ವಾಪಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ್‌ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಶ್ರೀ ನಾನಯ್ಯನವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಇವರು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Chief Minister).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, When I was entering the House I was a bit late and at that time Sri Arum ugham was making his statement on this very issue. I feel sorry because I did not have the opportunity to hear him completely but I was able to here him appeal in his last one or two sentences to the Leader of the Opposition not to press for either the suspension of the rule or for taking up this motion. I thought that after Sri Arumugham an Inde pendent made that appeal, the Leader of the Opposition would have taken the hint. But unfortunately the Leader of the Opposition has put himself in such a position that it has become very difficult to wriggle out of it. So, they are making all sorts of exercises. Presently I will say how they have got into a tight corner from where they want to wriggle out. They have given notice under rule 133. I understand they have given another notice under rule 146. This is enough proof for me to say in what tight corner they have placed the mselves. Only three days back they brought this resolution under rule 133. Yesterday after hearing members speaking and also my submission, perhaps some light might have dawned on them and now they are trying a motion under rule 146. Every time they bring a motion like this they want to know in advance whether the Speaker would give them permis sion. This is not the way. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree that he or myself or the members of the House have to respect the rules and work within the four corners of the rules.

They want permission of the House through you to suspend the rule. What they want, they have said in the resolution. Yesterday what we said was, tomorrow the Speaker can allow if they want to make a submission as to why this rule should be suspended and you allowed and we have heard. The long and short of what all they say is this. Because the subject matter relates to a minister and there are allegations and therefore to discuss this matter they want the suspension of rules so that their resolution can be taken up. As was pointed out by the hon. member Sri Nanayya and others, why were they keeping quiet all these days ? When was this Assembly started ?

4-00 P. M.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—We got this information when you answered the debate.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—It is not correct. The whole world knows that I have withdrawn the consent once given to the C. B. I. under certain enactments and if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition were to say that he came to know only a few days ago it is not correct.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—We know the matter was taken out from the C. B. I. But the matter was entrusted to the C. O. D. we came to know only three days before when the Chief Minister made the statement on the floor of the House after four months and that too when the Demands partaining to the Chief Minister was taken up, he made this known to us that he has referred the matter to the C. O. D. We want to know whether there can be a fair investigation. It is only last week we came to know that he has referred the matter to the C. O. D.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.— Did I say to this House as to on what date I made a reference. If he really wanted to know that it was referred, he could have asked me. Even before I gave the answer the matter had been referred to C. O. D.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—We did not know.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—That is not relevant to the subject matter. The point is this. He himself agrees that he is in the knowtedge of the fact that the Government after I took over as Chief Minister, took the decision to withdraw all those matters which had been referred by the Governor who was at that time functioning here under President's rule, from the C. B. I. That was not a hidden matter or secret matter. It was known to the press and the public. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was in the knowledge of it. We have said that these matters will no more be referred to the C. B. I. and all the referneces made in regard to allegations against the Minister except against me, were all withdrawn. Another thing was I remember to have made known to the public through the press in a Press Conference that we have a decision like this and so far as matters against the Chief Minister was concerned, I have stated that we did not take a decision to withdraw because it concerned me and I have allowed the C. B. I. to go on with investigation. Therefore, it is not correct on the part of the leader of the opposition to say that he came to know only three days back. May be that they could not make up their mind to take an attitude like this for all these days. That may be the reason that you kept quiet. Whatever it is, it is not my concern to go into the working of several members inside their party. I do not want to go into that. From what I have heard I can say that it took them 1½ months to come to a decision whether to raise a matter like this or not. Is it my fault ? Is it Governments fault ? Is it the fault of the House ? They did not decide all these days and because they could not take a decision they have come to the last lap and they want the House to give consent or suspending the rule. Having delayed the matter, they have to wait. It is not as if, heavens are going to fall overnight if this matter is not discussed. If the consequential effect would be disastrous, I can understand. Added to that, they repeat that they

did not make insinuation, they did not say against the Chief Minister. My point is, if they have that much of cortesy well and good ; if they do not have, then also well and good. But if they want to make insinuation according to the rules of procedure and parliamentary practice Iet them make. I also know how to make. I am not apologetic and I am not taking note of this or that. At the same time in one breath I heard justnow the Leader of the Opposition saying they are not making any insinuation We have the highest respect and at the same time he said refusing to discuss the matter only means he is left with no option but to infer that we are trying to shield something which we have committed. This inference he wants to draw if this House does not give consent. I ask him, is this the way he draws inference simply because a rule cannot be suspended. I can only say there is no validity in his thinking and logic. Inspite of this he wants to draw such an inference I only sympathise. Let him draw his conclusion. Again if the Leader of the Opposition and some of his friends draw such conclusions, it is not as if the State of Karnataka or the country not know what type of conclusions they jump to. Such inferences have been drawn but often hurled at us from public platforms. from press since many months, during ele.tion and before Election. What is it that you have left? You are not doing any thing extraordinary or wonderful which you have not done previously. There fore; even if they draw such wrong conclusion according to them it may be a right con clusion, it will not have any impact on the public mind. There is already enough proof for it, because it is during the time of the Governor that some Members who does not belong to this House, out side is said to have given certain allegations and those allegations ǝɹǝʍ referred to the C. B. I. It was just before the Elections all these things were done against the then Chief Minister. I was the Chief Minister then not only certain things were referred to the C. B. I., but things were also said in the public meeting. They have left no stone unturned to establish their case that myself and the Party which I headed and the Government which I headed was corrupt. Not only they spoke out all these things, but they brought people from Delhi also to speak.

(Some members from the Opposition stood up)

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಶಿವನಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇನು ಹರಿಕಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೆ? ಆಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ನಾವು ಬಯ್ದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಅವರು ಬಯ್ದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಈಗೇನು ? ಇವತ್ತಿನ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಇದೇನು ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಯೋ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವಾಗ ತಾವೇತಕ್ಕೆ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ನಾನೇನಾದರೂ ಅನ್‌ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರೆ, ಆಗ ನೀವು ಕೇಳಿ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ?

† SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, I rise to a Point of Order under Rule 311.. My submission is that you were good enough, when the Leader of the Opposition and other friends on this side were making their submissions to tell them repeatedly, not with standing what the hon'ble members on the other side pointed out, that the argument must be confined to the admissibility of the motion for the purpose of suspension of certain rule. This is the framework or forecorners of the rule within which we were asked repeatedly to make our submissions. If that is the yardstick, similar yardstick must be applied to the submissions that are being made by the Hon'ble the Leader of the House, viz., that he cannot go beyond the scope in the name of replying to the debate, cannot transgress and go beyond the circle within which he should also confine himself to make his submissions. He cannot invoke the entire jurisdiction of this country. He is going beyond the scope. He may convince that the House cannot give consent That is the ambit within which he must make his submission and he cannot go on delivering a lecture a simile and the morals of the Janata Party or the Opposition Party and go on making allegations and insinuations against the entire world. This is a serious issue which your good self should consider. He must be called upon to confine his submissions to the non-admissibility of the motion ; he should not be permitted to dilate upon all that he wants to say.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Chief Minister will confine himself only in respect of the admissibility or not of the motion.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, my friends felt very happy and tapped on the desk when hon'ble member Sri J. H. Patel gave a simile or a story.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—It is a fact now !

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Members on this side wanted to object. Sir, at least let them admit my generosity, I never wanted to interfere. I requested the members on this side to allow the hon'ble member to have his full say and speak out his story.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—So, so, we did !

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS,—You have not been doing it. That is my difficulty. When once a reference is made, you people hit at others, but when the same hit comes to you, you are unable to take it.

SRI GOVIND P. WADEYARAJ.—We hit back at the appropriate moment !

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I request the hon'ble member to have patience to sit and listen. Why should he jump up ?

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR. —Sir, the Hon'ble Chief Minister must be within the rule and the ambit of the rule.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I too enjoyed the story of my hon'ble friend Sri Patel. He said : 'one fellow was sleeping on the pian of the house and hundreds of people gathered around him. But when he began to caugh, all of them ran away'. He did a good job of the story. When I want to bring the same thing, even when before I begin caughing they all jump at me.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳಖ್ಯರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಂಜೆ ಐದು ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿ. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೋ ಮೊದಲು ಹಾಕಲಿ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಪಟ್ಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಾವು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಗಂಟೆಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS. —We did take it cooly and enjoyed the story narrated by Sri Patel When I said that you had brought people from Delhi, I never said the untruth, it was a fact. Why the hon'ble member is upsetting, I cannot understand. ನೀವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಜನ ಕೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು. ಯಾವ ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು. ಇವರು ಏನೇನೋ ಜಾಡು ಮಾಡಲು ಹೋದರು. ಅದು ನಡೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. People know how to make up their mind ; they know to which party they had to vote. People have exhibited their mind beyond doubt much to the chagrin of others. ನಾವು ದೋಷಾರೋಪಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಐ.ಗೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. It is true, we took a decision to withdraw the powers that were wrongly given, illegal procedure had been adopted at the time of giving or trasferring the powers of the State to the Delhi Special Police Establishment under section 6. Even these provisions which enunciated certain procedure had not been adhered to.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—There is already a decision of the High Court. I do not seek the advice of anybody to go to a court of law.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—These are very relevant and necessary points which I want them to hear. I have heard them patiently when they spoke.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—I repeat once again that this is not within the scope of the rules. He cannot make use of his right to reply in this manner.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I am not going outside the scope of the discussion. I know the hon'ble member Sri Lakshmisagar is in an angry mood.

Now in the resolution the Leader of the Opposition says, we have not made any insinuation. I say that he along with the sponsorers of the resolution have made insinuation against the Chief Minister. They have said that the Chief Minister has done it with an ulterior motive. It is there in black and white.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR,—He is not permitted to look into the resolution. He is looking at the resolution, picking up certain words and attacking us. I appeal to the Chair to prevent him from looking into the resolution. He cannot blow hot and cold at the sametime. He was very vehement in his attack.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I am not talking on the resolution at all ; I am not quoting from the rules.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—I raise a point of order. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಣ್ಣ ಕೊಡುವ ಬದಲು, ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಅಂಶ ಅಂಶವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುವುದರ ಬದಲು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಓದಿ ಬಿಡಲಿ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—The resolution is framed in such a manner that there is too much insinuation. This I have got to state. Why I say it, because a reference was made as to why the rule should be suspended and why permission should be given. He has also gone to the extent of saying that if this suspension is not there, he wants to draw an inference to the effect that we are trying shield something. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said. In reply to that I must say that this resolution is full of insinuation. Secondly the inference he wants to draw are utterly fellacious and illogical because these allegations have been made previously and inspite of these allegations the electorate have given their verdict I have not made any such attempts so far as my cases are concerned. So far as other Ministers are concerned, everyone of the cases (I do not refer to) has been with drawn, is a fact. Wherever the government felt that there is need for a further probe, that matter has been referred to the CBI. Under these circumstances, the demand made by the Leader of thb Opposition and the Opposition members to suspend the rule for taking up this resolution is not, according to me, in tune with the procedure and conduct of rules of this House. What they lack by way of delay they cannot try to make up their delay by asking the House to suspend the rules and give them permission to move the resolution. Again their mind is not yet made up whether it should be under rule 133 or rule 146.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Rule 146 is not before the House. He is bringing irrelevant matters which are not germane to the issue. ನಿಯಮದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಮೀರಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೂಲ್ ೧೪೬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೂಲ್ಸನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್.—ಇವರು ಏಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೋಪದಿಂದ್ದಾರೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ನೀವು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇವರು ಉಪದೇಶ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಂದು. ಹೇಳುವುದು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು. ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಚೌಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಅವರು ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛೆಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ಬೇರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕುಳಿತು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್‌ರವರು ವಕೀಲರಾಗಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡೂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಪೂರ್ತಿ ತಿಳಿದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಪೂರ್ತಿ ತಿಳಿಯದೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅರ್ಧಂಬರ್ಧ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರ ಸಹವಾಸ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ.

4—30 P. M.

† SRI J. H. PATEL.—Sir, I raise a point of order. Under Rule 280, it is stated that no Member shall anticipate the discussion of any subject of which notice has been given provided that in determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation regard shall be had by the Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the Assembly within a reasonable time.''

The Hon. Chief Minister has referred to certain matters which are not in the Resolution and without the resolution being discussed. My submission is this. Either he should be prevented from making such submissions on such matters which are not before the House or I go an extent further and say that he is a sport and he stands for certain things. Therefore, let us forget all these technical rules and let us straight away discuss this matter. Let the Chief Minister agree if he has got the guts.

† SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I have not made any references to the resolution. I merely said that inferences could be drawn in such a way. The resolution is full of insinuations. Rule 146—I have not quoted. It is he who quoted and referred to it. Mr. Laxmisagar referred to Rule 146. That is why they are having this double mind. They have referred to both 133 and 146. He says that I am sport. he too a sport. But only one thing we have to remember. He said that let us forget everything; and let us allow the discussion. I want to ask one point here. A boy and girl make love. But for all outside world, they must be married—whether it is love marriage, or Gandharva marriage or registered marriage. In the same way, the hon. Member wants to drag away the girl even without a registered marriage. So, let us not view this matter in that spirit, and it can't be also. That cannot happen my dear Patel. At least some registered marriage must be there. There is no question of giving

permission to suspend the rules. This is a matter which should wait and take its legitimate way in accordance with the Rules. That is all my submission.

† SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The Hon. Chief Minister has raised certain points. The first point is about delay. I would like to know from the Chief Minister, after the matter was withdrawn from the CBI, on what date it was referred to COD ?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—It was referred to COD on 18th March.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The matter was withdrawn from the CBI immediately after the new Government took charge, *i. e.* in the month of March. But it was not referred to COD immediately. The Government has the power to refer it to C. O. D. even after withdrawing from C. B. I. So, there is a question of delay. We came to know that the matter was referred to C. O. D. only when it was stated on the floor of the House. Until that time, it was not made known to the public. It was made known on 29th July when the Hon. Chief Minister was replying to the debate. After that only, we have thought of raising this matter. The principle involved, I have already explained. It is the State Police who are investigating against a Minister of the State. The Chief Minister stated that we could not come to a decision for nearly 1½ months. But that matter was not known to us at all. There is correspondence between the Chief Minister and the President of our Party. After receiving a reply from the Chief Minister then the matter was raised in our party meeting. Difference of opinion was there in the party. My partymen wanted to have it in a democratic way. They wanted us to include the Chief Minister along with the Minister now involved. But on principle, I said that the Chief Minister is bold enough to refer it to the CBI, and so we did not club the Hon. Chief Minister with the present Minister on whom certain charges were made. Now, there is no difference of opinion and everybody supported it after discussion. To that extent, delay is not on our part; but the delay is on the part of the Government to refer the matter to C. O. D.

Then the Chief Minister was repeating and repeating. I don't know how long they repeated before election. He said leaders of our party had come here. Similarly, his party leaders had also come.

The Chief Minister has been saying that in spite of all the allegations people elected his partymen. How long is he going to repeat it ?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—We repeat it so long as you do not understand it.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—We never make it a matter for election propaganda. The Chief Minister has not understood the principle involved in the resolution.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I am not going into the principle involved. It is merely regarding the suspension of the rule. If you want, I am prepared to speak out.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮುಂಗಿಯುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I concede that the people have given him all support in the elections. But that does not mean that he should protect a person who is involved in an investigation. When a man in power is involved and the matter is under investigation, is it fair for him to continue in office? He wants to continue him in the Cabinet.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಮತ್ತೆ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಲ್ಲ ವಿನಹ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಷಯ ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೂ ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು—ತಾವು ಬೇರೆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ನಾನು ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. For seven years, he was the Chief Minister. Why did he not withdraw the consent giving powers for investigation to the C.B.I. when Mrs. Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister? Had he the courage to do it then?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಇದರ ಆಡ್ಮಿಸಿಬಿಲಿಟಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಡೀವಿಯೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. I am sorry you are deviating from the subject.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ತಾವು ಏಕೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ? ಅವರು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಕೇಂದ್ರಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು, ಜನತಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ನಾಯಕರುಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು, ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆದ್ದಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನೂ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರಿ. ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕರಾರು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಇಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಪಾಯಿಂಟೌಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನೀವು ಈ ತರಹ ಡೀವಿಯೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ತಾವು ಎರಡು ಕಡೆಯವರ ವಿತಂಡವಾದವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅದೇ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಸವಿನಯದಿಂದ ವಿಜ್ಞಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಏನು ಇದೆ, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮಗೆ ನಾವು ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಯಾವ ನಿಯಮಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ತಾವು ನಮ್ಮ

ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ತಾವು ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಗುರುತಿಸಿ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಅವರು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಏನು ಭಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಚೌಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೋ ಅದೇ ಚೌಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಇವರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಬೇರೆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

(ಮಾನ್ಯಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋದರು)

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ.ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ನಾನು ತಾವು ಹೇಳು ವುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ, ತಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಡೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವರು ಹೆದರಿಕೊಂಡು ಏಕೆ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು?

(ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳುವ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎದ್ದು ಕೂಗಿದರು)

ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋವಿಂದ ಪಿ ಒಡೆಯರಾಜ್—ಇಂದಿರಾ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರು ಇದ್ದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ವಿತ್‌ಡ್ರಾ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮನಾಯಕರು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಓಡಿ ಹೋದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ ನಾಯಿಡು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ದೇವೇಗೌಡರು ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋದರು ಎಂದು ನೋಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಇದರ ಮೂಲ ಕರ್ತೃ ದೇವೆಗೌಡರು ಓಡಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್.ಟಿ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಹತ್ವದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಯ ವಾದವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ವಿಧಿನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಡಿಲಗೊಳಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದರಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೇನು ವಾದ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿ ಯಾಯಿತು. ನಂತರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಿ, ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಸಡಿಲ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ, ಅಥವಾ ಬಿಡಬೇಕೇ ಎನ್ನುವ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರೆ, ನಾಳೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಇದೇ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳುವ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ದೇವೇಗೌಡರು, ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದು ಕೂಗಿದರು)

MR. SPEAKER.—Hon.Members should not directly speak with other Hon.Members. I have noted down the suggestion of Sri H. T. Krishnappa. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿಯವರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ.

SRI S R. BOMMAI.—The Hon.Chief Minister incidentally referred to the withdrawing the consent under the Delhi Special Police Act. He said that even the proper procedure was not adopted. I would like to know from him, is it only in 1978, the wisdom came to him or the heroism came to him? Why not during the last 6–7 years when he was the Chief Minister and Smt. Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister. Why the wisdom has so late came to him? That shows the intention of withdrawing the consent. It is how done only with the object of

shielding himself and his colleagues from the possible prosecution and possible conviction because there is a different Government. That is the real intention. He cannot claim heroism or wisdom in that act. He referred to the result of the elections. In Karnataka, people have voted Congress (I) but throughout the country, Congress (I) has been Swept out.

MR. SPEAKER.—I don't want election matters and party matters to be discussed here.

(ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊಂದಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅವರ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರು)

ನೀವು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಯಾವುದು ಮತ್ತು ನೀವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾದರು ಏನು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್—ಕೂಗಾಡಬೇಡಿ, ಕೇಳಿ; ನೀವು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಎಲಿ ಎಲಿ ಒದ್ದಾಡಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಗಂಗಾಧರನ್—ನೀವು ೩ ದಿನಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಅದ್ಯಕ್ಷರು:—ಇವತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಉಳಿದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಆದರೆ ಎರಡು ಕಡೆಯವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕೂಗಾಟಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಂತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ ನಾಯ್ಡು:—ಅವರೆಲ್ಲ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹೋಗಲಿ, ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ, ನಂತರ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು.

(ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿಯವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದರು)

Mr. SPEAKER— Don't record.

xxxx xxxx xxxx

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು—ತಾವು ವಿಷಯ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ತಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ನಾನು ಏನೋ ವಿರೊಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಎಂದು ಗೌರವ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇನ್ನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಉಳಿದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಎಂದರೆ.........

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—I would say that the verdict of the people as I understand of Karnataka is in favour of Congress (I) Party...

MR. SPEAKER—I don't want those things. I am not interested with this party or that party. I am only interested in protecting the law order and justice.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—In my opinion, the verdict of the people was in favour of them; but for Smt. Indira Gandhi, he would not have become the Chief Minister. Lastly, he said about insinuations. I would once again make it clear that there is no insinuation. The resolution is motivated with the high object of keeping up the purity of the administration. The Hon. Chief Minister has raised to the occasion and taken proper action earlier in case of Mr. Kittur. I don't know

---

xxxx Matter was not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

why he is hesitating now. In that case, he referred the matter to CBI. Let him refer this matter also to C B.I. and create a good convention. I still appeal that the rule be suspended and let the resolution be discussed and after the debate, it is for the Hon.Chief Minister to take proper action.

// MR. SPEAKER.—Sriyuths S. R. Bommai and several other members have given notice of a Resolution under Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure. The Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure relates to Non-official Resolutions. The procedure regarding Non-official resolutions in indicated in the Rules from 133 to 145. It has also connection with Rule 28 (5). Sub-rule 5 of Rule 28 indicates the procedure for ballot of Non-official Resolutions. Today is not a day allotted for Non-official Business. Hon'ble Member Sri S.R. Bommai and others have given a notice for suspension of Rule 133 under Rule 322 of the Rules of Procedure. For the benefit of the Members, I will read Rule 322:—

> "Any member may, with consent of the Speaker, move that any rule may be suspended in its application to a particular motion before the Assembly and if the motion is carried the rule in question shall be suspended for the time being."

According to this Rule suspension of any Rule is to be by a Motion adopted in the House. For such a Motion to be brought before the House consent of the Speaker is necessary. On a plain reading of the rule, it appears to me that a Rule can be suspended in its application to a particular Motion before the Assembly. After the matter was raised yesterday, I have given careful thought to this matter.

I have before me the Book by Sri S. L. Shakdher and Sri M. N. Kaul on Practice and Procedure of Parliament, wherein it is stated as follows:—

> "Motion for suspension of rule in its application to a particular motion may be moved only when that motion is before the House *i.e.*, if it is included in the list.
>
> There are three classess of business: business before the House at the moment; business before the House for the day (*i. e.*, included in the List of Business but not before the House at the moment); and business pending in the House but not before the House (*i. e.*, not included in the List of Business). It has been Ruled that business pending in the House but not included in the List of Business, is not "Business before the House" for purposes of the rule relating to suspension of rules".

In a ruling given by the Speaker, Lok Sabha it has been stated that Motions of which notices have been given cannot be considered as Motions before the House at all. I therefore withhold my consent to the Motions for suspension of Rule 133. I request the members to close all discussions on this matter.

5-00 P.M.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, we bow to the ruling given by the Chair. But in protest against the attitude of the Government, we stage a walk out.

(ಆರ್.ಪಿ.ಐ. ಮತ್ತು ಸಿ.ಪಿ.ಐ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳೂ ಸಭಾತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದರು)

SRI B. BHASKAR SHETTY.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, now we can take up Karnataka Electricity Supply Undertakings (Acquisition)(Amendment) Bill, 1978 and other two small bills for consideration. We can take up these bills under Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅಜೆಂಡಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮೂರು ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ.—ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಬೇರೆ ಮಸೂದೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು. ಅದನ್ನು ತಡೆಹಿಡಿದು ಬೇರೆ ಮಸೂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Member Mr. Bhaskar Shetty quoted rule 96. Rule 96 reads as under:

> "At any stage of a Bill which is under discussion in the Assembly a motion that the debate on the Bill be adjourned may be moved with the consent of the Speaker."

Further I shall read rule 97 also. It reads:

> "97. The member incharge of a Bill may, at any stage of the Bill, move for leave to withdraw the Bill; and if such leave is granted no further motion shall be made with reference to the Bill".

This can be done with the consent of Speaker. Let us pass these small bills and send there to the other House for discussion.

Karnataka Entertainment Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1978

Motion to Consider

† SRI S.M. YAHYA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Karnataka Entertainment Tax (Amendment Bill, 1978 be taken into consideration".

The question was proposed